

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/830,093	04/23/2004	Donald Wayne Jackson	P08159US01/RFH	P08159US01/RFH 7521	
881	7590 01/04/2006		EXAM	NER	
STITES & HARBISON PLLC			NGUYEN, THU V		
1199 NORTH FAIRFAX STREET SUITE 900			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	IA, VA 22314		3661		

DATE MAILED: 01/04/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/830,093	JACKSON, DONALD WAYNE			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Thu Nguyen	3661			
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap	1	orrespondence address			
Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPI WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING [- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION .136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tind d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from te, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>05 (</u>	October 2005				
	is action is non-final.				
,	_				
closed in accordance with the practice under	· ·				
Disposition of Claims					
4)⊠ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application	n.				
4a) Of the above claim(s) 6-14 is/are withdraw					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-5 and 15-21</u> is/are rejected.					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement.				
Application Papers					
9)⊠ The specification is objected to by the Examine	er				
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on 23 April 2004 is/are: a		ov the Examiner			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	•				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct		• •			
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the E		• •			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	n priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)	-(d) or (f).			
a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documen	to have been received				
		am Nia			
2. Certified copies of the priority documen3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority					
application from the International Burea		d in this National Stage			
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	d			
	. c. and domined doples flot receive	u.			
Attachment(s)					
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)			
2) D Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da	te			
 Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date) 5) Notice of Informal Pa	atent Application (PTO-152)			

DETAILED ACTION

The response to the restriction requirement filed on October 5, 2005 is acknowledged. By this response, the species group I (including claims 2-5, 18-21) has been elected with traverse. Upon considering applicant's argument, the examiner decides to maintain the restriction requirement (refer to section "response to argument" below), accordingly, claims 1-5, 15-21 are examined in this office action.

Specification

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

The "brief description of drawings" (paragraph [0031]) does not include a description to fig.4f.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1-5, 15-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Simon (US 6,570,486) in view of Smith (US 5,349,329).

As per claim 1, Simon teaches remote access device for a vehicle. The system comprises: a first electronic control device 24 (fig.3) mounted on the vehicle for transmitting a

Application/Control Number: 10/830,093

Art Unit: 3661

characteristic signal (col.4, lines 66-67; col.5, lines 1-2; col.6, lines 36-38); a second electronic control device 46 (fig.3) to be carried by a person for receiving the characteristic signal and for returning signal to the transmitter/receiver of the first control device (col.5, lines 24-27, lines 34-42, lines 59-67; col.6, lines 1-2). Simon does not explicitly disclose allowing the user to wear the transmitter, controlling continued operation of the vehicle, and the control unit that calculates the distance between the first and second control devices for disabling vehicle when the distance is greater than a predetermined distance. However, adapting the transmitter in a specific shape wearable to a person would have been well known and obvious matter of design choice. Moreover, Simon teaches the controller 24 (fig.3) that is capable of controlling the actuator of devices (col.3, lines 35-38), and considering the signal strength in continuing operation of the vehicle (col.6, lines 35-45). Furthermore, Smith teaches controlling continued operation of the vehicle when a distance is within a predetermined distance (col.4, lines 11-33). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to disable the vehicle taught by Simon when the distance between the user and the vehicle is larger than a predetermined distance as taught by Smith in order to prevent hi-jacking situation in which the user is pushed away from the vehicle.

As per claim 2, Smith suggests including a relay connected to the electrical system of the vehicle for opening the vehicle electrical system (col.7, lines 40-43). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement a relay circuit to the apparatus of Simon in order to facilitate selecting disabling or enabling of a specific actuator.

Application/Control Number: 10/830,093

Page 4

Art Unit: 3661

As per claim 3, Smith teaches connecting a relay contact to the ignition circuit to control disconnection of the ignition circuit (col.12, lines 6-21).

As per claim 4-5, Smith teaches electronic control circuit which can be any electrical power circuit (col.5, lines 24-28), moreover, with respect to claim 4, connecting a relay to the fuel injection control circuit for controlling fuel injection to enable or disable the operation of the vehicle would have been both known and obvious matter of design choice.

As per claim 15, Simon teaches radio signals (col.3, lines 41-48).

As per claim 16, shaping the remote control device in a particular appearance such as a well known shape of a pager would have been both known and obvious mater of design choice.

As per claim 17-21, refer to claim 1-5, and 15 above.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's election with traverse of species I in the reply filed on October 5, 2005 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that the features discloses in the species are not mutually exclusive nor variations of a particular embodiment. This is not found persuasive because as disclosed in paragprah 0012-0018, the features as disclosed can be included or omitted from the system, when such the features are optionally included or omitted from the

Application/Control Number: 10/830,093 Page 5

Art Unit: 3661

circuits, the system with the inclusion or omission of the features result in different circuits with specific limited function, they are therefore of different species.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thu Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-6967. The examiner can normally be reached on T-F (7:30-6:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas Black can be reached on (571) 272-6956. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

December 20, 2005

THU V. NGUYEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER

bequienter